DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 463 SP 030 919

AUTHOR Bower, Ann M.
TITLE Getting at the Core of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program: Relationships.
PUB DATE Feb 89
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (St. Louis, MO, February 18-22, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Case Studies; *Data Collection; Inservice Teacher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Interviews; *Mentors; Observation; *Research Methodology; *Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS *New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Prog

ABSTRACT

This paper points out the value of methods that are qualitative in nature in order to collect data regarding the essence of a formalized relationship between a mentor teacher and an intern teacher. Of several cases examined during the second year (1987-88) of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program, one case is presented as an illustration of the kind of product this methodology is capable of producing. Strategies, such as semi-structured interviews and non-participant observations, are suggested in order to arrive at both comparable data across subjects and insightful information from the subjects' perspective about the phenomenon being described. Case studies arrived at in this manner offer program planners, administrators, researchers, mentors, and other teachers the opportunity to examine on-going experiences throughout different stages of a mentor teacher-intern teacher formalized relationship. Descriptions of events within these relationships can also increase the potential for more fully informed decisions by state policy makers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303463

Getting at the Core of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program: Relationships

Ann M. Bower

Syracuse University

Paper presented at the 1989 annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, St. Louis, Missouri, February 18-22, 1989. Paper available from the author at 4888 Coventry Road, Syracuse, New York 13215.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. M. Bower

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 030919

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Getting at the Core of the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program: Relationships

by Ann M. Bower
Syracuse University

Introduction

In 1986 New York State began the piloting of a mentoring program that has been centered around the development of a formal relationship between a more-experienced classroom teacher and a less-experienced classroom teacher, more concisely known as a mentor and an intern. This Mentor Teacher-Internship Program has had a two-fold purpose: the easing of the transition from prior school and/or work experiences for beginning teachers; and the stemming of the outflow of quality newcomers who begin a teaching career but do not remain in it.

As the decade comes to a close, the Empire State continues to respond to the call for more and better teachers through the continuation and expansion of this unique type of induction program, one that focuses on relationships and requires competitively-funded school districts to provide the released time necessary for the development of these relationships. The flexibility of permitting each school district to implement its local project in ways that are best suited to each one's needs has been identified as one of the program's strengths. Small and large, urban, suburban, and rural districts set out to

pioneer methods and set up projects which would lend support to many different types of formalized mentor-intern relationships. As a result, many different models have emerged from data collected using a range of instruments documenting and describing the program's first year. One of the conclusions of the pilot year study was that there is a need to investigate specific mentor-intern relationships in depth (Mager, with Bower, Corwin, Davis, & DeBolt, 1986).

The research conducted by this author has attempted to respond to this need for richer data concerning mentor teacher-intern teacher relationships in a formal program. This particular paper presents the design of the author's study and describes briefly one of the seven formalized mentor-intern relationships that has been studied in depth throughout the second year of the State program. The manner in which this particular piece of research has been framed has enabled the author to provide detailed descriptions of each relationship as it has unfolded. The single case reported here is not a model case, but rather is offered as one of a myriad of complex relationships. It is put forth to demonstrate the need for greater understanding on the part of legislators, administrators, planners, and teachers about the intricacies of each particular, formalized, mentor-intern relationship.

Highlights of New York State's Mentor Teacher-Internship Program (MT-IP).

Even though much adaptability in implementation of projects has been allowed for local educational agencies, other criteria have been more specific and have been outlined in the requests for proposals sent out to the school districts by the State department. These criteria include: 1) a selection committee should choose the mentor(s) from experienced, highly thought of teachers who volunteer for the position, 2) the responsibility for the manner in which the mentor-intern match is made is to be left up to the superintendent, and 3) individual mentors and interns receive release time, rather than a stipend, to be used to establish their relationships. The monies provided each district are to be used primarily for replacement teachers to substitute for the mentors and interns when they are not in their classrooms.

The legislation for the 1986-87 pilot program year stated that the interns, described as full-time probationary teachers in the initial year of service in a particular licensed area or area of certificate title, were to be released from classroom instruction a minimum of 20% of classroom instruction time. The mentors had to be released 10% of their time per intern, but were required to carry a minimum of 60% classrooom instruction time. Twenty-four

districts' proposals were accepted and funded in the first year of the program.

The same focus and objectives continued into MT-IP's second year, 1987-88. In fact, there was only one significant change in the criteria established for mentors and interns: provision was made for both part-time and full-time mentors. Experienced teachers serving as part-time mentors were still required to carry no less than a 60% classroom instruction assignment. Teachers selected as full-time mentors were expected to spend 100% of their instructional day providing mentor services and would only be able to serve in this capacity for two years within a five year period. No more than an 80% classroom instruction assignment was to be given to any intern in the program. Twenty-nine districts received funding in the second year, with a considerable increase in the number of mentors and interns served (Mager, with Corwin, 1988).

MT-IP is now in its third year and continues to have additional monies approved for its growth by the New York State legislature. Fifty educational agencies are presently enjoying its benefits.

Design of the Research

A goal of this study has been to help illuminate in depth a small number of mentor-intern relationships in a formalized program through the production of case studies

about them. It is important to note here that there has not been an attempt to arrive at an ideal relationship, if indeed, any exists. Documentation of actual experiences and descriptions of on-going relationships as they evolved are presented from the participants' perspective. Views held by the subjects have been considered both necessary and valuable to expand the knowledge base in the young field of formalized mentoring for classroom teachers.

Methodological approach. The manner in which data have been collected by the researcher has been qualitative in nature. Bogdan & Biklen's (1982) text, Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods, concentrates solely on this particular method. Following many of their suggestions, the author has gone to the particular settings (4) under study, collected descriptive data and, thus, arrived at findings disseminated through words, rather than numbers. She has, additionally, been concerned with the perspectives of the subjects and has emphasized process, not simply product.

Interviewing and observing. The specific descriptive strategies used have been interviews and field observations because they are considered to be the most suitable for examination and documentation of dynamic relationships. Interviews (54), using an adaptation of interview guides as suggested by Borg and Gall (1983), have been similarly

designed in a semi-structured format, with several open-ended questions. Specific procedures used in interviews have varied slightly from one setting to another and from one interview to another. Typically, however, the inteviews have been tape recorded and transcribed. They range in length from about twenty minutes to an hour and a half, depending on the amount of time the subject permitted. Each intern and mentor has been interviewed separately four times throughout the course of the school year. Every program coordinator has also been interviewed once, as well as one teacher's aide and a replacement teacher. The majority of the interviews have taken place within the different school buildings in which the participants worked. The interviews consisted of probing questions dealing with the beginning, mid-points, and ending of the official, or formal relationship. Parallel formats of the four core interviews were developed for both mentors and interns. Extemporaneous questioning also occurred, both on site and by means of telephone calls.

The researcher also made additional visits to the four different contexts (two urban and two suburban), both to better comprehend each relationship as it unfolded and to understand the culture of specific schools within each district. It was also believed that the role of other players within the organization could be documented in a more well-rounded fashion through the observation of both

the participants in the study and those who interacted with them. While the researcher had planned to be present at least twice a month as a nonparticipant observer (in addition to the interview time), the number of observations varied from district to district, depending on cooperation and availability of the subjects, weather conditions, school vacations, etc. Two of the school districts were particularly helpful in arranging observation time. The case reported in this paper took place at one of these: A case of a relationship between a white, female mentor in her late forties and a white, male intern in his early thirties. Both were special education teachers in an urban, elementary school in the Charlesville City School District (names of districts, subjects, etc. have been changed to preserve the anonymity of the participants). The author was able to observe in this district a total of 12 times.

Settings and subjects. There were four districts that could be reached (within seventy-five miles from researcher's home) and used for data collection. Since each of the four districts was quite different, the researcher was able to look at a variety in organizational structures and mentoring projects within each structure.

The program coordinators in these districts expressed interest in the study and agreed to allow the researcher to request the permission of mentors and interns to both

interview and observe them over the course of the school year. All mentors and interns contacted were requested to volunteer to become participants. Many did. Then the researcher made the final selection of pairs based on the variables present in the demographic information provided to her. Content area, subject area, context ratio of interns to mentors, age, gender, race, personality, and first or second year participation by the school district in the New York State program were all variables that were considered in selecting the subjects from the four contexts. The range of options, however, was not unlimited. The total number of mentors (5) was not evenly matched to the number of interns (7) This is due to the fact that not all mentors had two interns.

The unit of analysis in this study has been the mentor-intern pair. There were seven such units or pairs in four different contexts from which data have been collected. The number of pairs and contexts is important because it has been small enough to allow the researcher to observe a number of relationships in depth, yet represents as much variety as possible within the established design. If one mentor had two interns and these proteges were both studied because of their varying characteristics, the relationship that the mentor had with each one of these persons was considered separate and unique.

Limitations

There have been some limiting factors in this study. First of all, only a small number of mentor-intern pairs were studied, rather than the hundreds that existed in the second year of the New York State Program. This was a conscious decision made in order to garner a deeper understanding of some of the types of relationships that were ongoing in the 1987-88 school year.

Secondly, data collection was concentrated in one section of New York State (although districts were as widely dispersed as possible). There has been, however, no attempt to generalize to other school districts and other mentoring projects. Conversely, an attempt to document a variety of experiences in diverse relationships was undertaken.

In addition, no evaluation has been done on the quality of the programs or the success of the mentor-intern relationships. Because this has been primarily a descriptive study, the researcher has constantly worked to maintain a nonjudgmental persspective.

Furthermore, since the researcher obtained the names of the districts through the state evaluator and approached each district through the local project coordinator, expectation of participation by the subjects may have been created. If any mentors and interns did perceive participation as unavoidable, most seemed to want to

continue offering ideas about their relationships and appeared proud to be able to serve their profession in this endeavor.

Finally, because it was not possible to determine the potentially accessible districts until October of 1987, information about the beginnings of some relationships that started either formally or informally in September were dependent on recall of the subjects. This time period was still considered close enough to be accurate.

The Profiling of a Relationship

Herein is presented a case of a formalized relationship between mentor teacher, Cathy, and intern teacher, Joe. There were many salient parts to this relationship. It was considered most relevant, however, to the paper's purpose to emphasize the following: description of the mentor and intern, including the personal and professional background of each and the perceptions of each subject about one another, themselves, and some actual experiences as they "traveled" through different stages of the relationship. In the presentation that follows a number of direct quotes are taken from data collected for the researcher's study on mentor teacher-intern teacher relationships in the New York State Program.

There often has been a lack of attention paid to the lives and aspirations of adults who are teachers.

Additionally, teachers' needs and development have sometimes gone unnoticed while analysts have concentrated on the emotional demands of the work (Lightfoot, 1983). However, "each beginning teacher (and also each experienced teacher) comes into the profession with a personality, a family and schooling background, professional training experiences, and beliefs about teaching that interact with the context in which they must learn to teach" (Wildman, Magliaro, Niles, McLaughlin, and Drill, 1988, p.20). The author considers, therefore, background material on the lives of Cathy and Joe to be an essential part of their case study.

Cathy's background. Cathy is a white, female, special education teacher in her late forties, who has been involved in various area of remediation for many years, both before and "after taking time off to have a family." During her first year in special education at Charlesville City School District in the 1970's, she met and was mentored by another more-experienced special education teacher some ten years her senior. She discussed their work together in the seventies, talking about times when "supplies were worse than they are now." However, district policies, especially regarding special education, seemed to have disillusioned her more and more as the years progressed, so much so that she actually submitted her resignation on a few occasions. Each time some person or change in the location of her

position persuaded her to reconsider leaving the district. Cathy spoke about her belief that special education teachers are especially isolated from other teachers, calling herself and her department, "The Wicked Stepsisters", a term she had coined because of the fact that some teachers of special education were still using 1969 textbooks and often were forgotten about at teacher workshops. She also conveyed, however, a certain pride in her perception that special education teachers usually have a cohesiveness much greater than "even the cohesiveness in the elementary school culture."

Cathy participated in many professional and community activities. When questioned by the researcher, she reluctantly acknowledged being involved in at least ten groups. She had also just "come off of" several years of leadership roles in her church. She attributed her ability to have a career, participate in community affairs, and raise two children to a supportive family, especially her husband, "who is very helpful."

When the researcher met Cathy, she was in her second year of serving as a mentor teacher. She explained that in the pilot year of the State program she had felt both burdened by the extra work involved in mentoring and concerned about leaving her special education class for the released time that the program required. She remembered that she had been close to leaving her appointment as a

mentor around Christmas time, 1986. Still, she persevered, got through the holidays, and expressed great satisfaction in herself for being able to deal with these concerns satisfactorily. She was gratified that her perceptions about her new role gradually changed, and she had come to perceive the mentoring of classroom teachers as an opportunity for professional growth for herself and beginning teachers, as well as a way to multiply benefits (though also creating some difficulties) for many more students than she could reach alone. She had arrived at this realization after attending an out-of-state course on coaching and mentoring, one in which the local project coordinator encouraged her participation. "I think that crystalized what we had been doing all year," she explained. It was at this conference that she also became aware of many techniques about which she had previously not known and spoke to another experienced teacher about "looking at things we've been doing all these years that might have been not the right thing to do."

Throughout the year of this study, Cathy seemed to be enjoying recognition both in special education and as a second year mentor. Her principal and the project coordinator spoke about her as an accomplished professional. The interns (2) with whom she worked pointed to her practice of asking them for advice when planning different experiences for them. During the second half of the school

year in which this study took place, she took a staff development course one day a week after school and spoke eagerly about future attendance at another national conference in order to further enhance her mentoring skills.

At the beginning of the second year's project, Cathy was the mentor teacher for two interns, neither of whom had had undergraduate education work. A formal mentor-intern relationship with one of these interns is summarized in this paper.

Joe's background. Joe, an intern teacher in special education, is a "thirtyish," white male who had majored in sociology and law enforcement and minored in coaching while in college. He had taken no education courses. Not only had he played college football, he had coached both Pop Warner football and high school football for the last several years in Charlesville. He had been told that continued employment with the Charlesville City School District was dependent upon his obtaining his Master's degree in special education, with courses commencing sometime during the 1987-1988 school year.

Joe spoke at length to the researcher about his experiences as a police officer before returning to Charlesville, his hometown. He also mentioned teaching for a number of months in Charlesville schools a few years previous to his present appointment. When asked by the

researcher about why he didn't stay in teaching the first time, he responded, "I didn't want to stay in it because I really didn't know what to expect, how to teach, and I was somewhat-if you don't mind me using coaching terms- a little 'gun shy' coming in. Here I am, me against 20 or 12 students." He had resigned, he said, for personal reasons. When considering returning to the teaching profession, Joe alluded to the encouragement of his sisters:

> ...who told me, 'Hey, you can coach. You're not afraid of coaching. You should not be afraid of teaching. It's the same thing. The only thing you're teaching math. Out there you're a guy teaching a guy how to block. You're teaching spelling. Then how to tackle. It's just a different thing you have to teach.'... I decided, let me take a chance. What do I have to lose? The job I did have was a dead end.

As the school year progressed, Joe shared a little more about his personal life with the researcher. He had been married fairly young, had a child, was divorced. The early months in his present teaching position had been particularly difficult for him, both personally and professionally. Within days, he had been appointed as a special education teacher in Sherman Elementary School in the Charlesville district, was married for the second time,

and had begun the work of teaching. He wasn't formally matched with Cathy, the mentor, until the third week in September. His recollection of getting started in a field about which he knew nothing was "`Here's your classroom key. Here's your kids' and that was it". He turned to other teachers who had gone through the same situation. "I sat down and talked with them and a lot of them told me I was better off than they were. At least (they said to him) you knew enough how to get books, where to get them, how to hunt them down." He seemed to realize he wasn't so well off, however, mentioning such problems as his lack of knowledge about the administration of diagnostic tests, a necessary part of his work. He spoke about having problems with his principal at first, but she became more understanding of his needs after he entered the mentoring project.

In addition to finding time to spend with his child, Joe also coached football for Charlesville until some time in October. Furthermore, he had been approached to coach wrestling, but had to refuse because of the course work he needed to take in the second half of the school year.

Joe occasionally expressed his views about the field of special education, perceiving that a lot of teachers and principals didn't even want it in the building. He offered an example of a "kid who is supposed to be mainstreamed into math. None of the teachers want him because he's a

troublemaker. The principals' don't want him in there because of hassling their office..."

Sometimes Joe prefaced his beliefs in words that suggested the opposite of what might have been the case. For example, "I don't want to sound biased, prejudiced, whatever, but I have to be this coach, this macho type guy..." When asked if he felt comfortable asking Cathy for help, he replied, "Manhood wise, No. I don't feel comfortable asking. I feel like a dummy asking three or four times, but to learn something, that's different." He further elaborated that he would never call Cathy at home about any of his concerns, but it didn't bother him to call her at her school every once in awhile if he was stuck on something. At one point, early in the year, Joe pointed to the surprise of the rest of the staff when he addressed his female principal as "Sunshine". He also frequently referred to his other female colleagues as "girls". By June there were subtle indications of an awareness that he needed to become more professional in the way he dealt with others in his job. He described his new insight, "...I know how far to go. I think, 'Ohh, you'd better cool it,' and I can cool it..." He was considering decorating his classroom the following year, "even though (referring to gender) I don't have the knack for that stuff." He spoke about how surprised he was with himself and indicated he was "shocked as hell" with some of the changes he had undergone.

Finally, Joe moved to the practical consideration of how he was going to make the money he needed to take some more courses over the summer. He had been trying to get employment, in addition to completing all of the details necessary to end the school year. He had been considering two options: working at a neighborhood center near his home with "kids he might have the following year" or, if that didn't work out, possibly, cleaning swimming pools.

The nature of Cathy and Joe's mentor-intern relationship in a formalized program. Sometime early in the school year, Cathy had been asked by the program coordinator to have Joe, a beginning teacher whose principal was already considering terminating his appointment, as the second intern with whom she worked. She explained to the researcher that she had been able to keep an open mind regarding the difficulties he was reported to be experiencing. From the beginning of the relationship, she had decided to encourage Mike at every opportunity, while pointing out, matter-of-factly, how he might behave differently in order to avoid problems. Since she and Joe did not work in the same building, Cathy would stop at his school early in the morning or late in the afternoon to see how he was doing. Cathy stated that she didn't think it was her place as a mentor to teach Joe the politics of his building, even though she did have a few friends there. On the other hand, she felt it was important

for mentors to help interns know the politics of the district.

Joe, Cathy, and a second intern who had had experience in dealing with people with disabilities, would usually meet for an entire day each week for either assistance with workbooks, tests, IEP's, and so on, and/or to go on fieldtrips, visit homes of students, view tapes, discuss problems, review observations. Occasionally, they would work individually with Cathy in the morning or the afternoon. On one occasion, she had given them both workbooks on the prior day. The other intern with whom Cathy worked had her workbook all done. Joe needed help with his, so both women helped him.

During one of the researcher's early interviews, Joe mentioned that he had told Cathy that he was having trouble with his attendance register. To his surprise, Cathy had come to his school one morning, corrected all of his addition, changed his numbers, and left a note saying that it was all fixed for him. He said, "Somebody else would have just said - here's your mistake. Now fix it yourself." During this same interview (several weeks into the relationship), the researcher queried Joe about trust. He indicated that he wasn't ready to really trust anyone in the district, but himself. He did say that he thought Cathy liked him and by this time, even thought that "he was doing pretty good." He talked about a figurative grade of "C"

that Cathy might give him as a beginning teacher, to which he pointed as "a pretty good grade". In November, when questioned as to whether or not he perceived Cathy as a friend, he seemed to avoid responding directly, "... there is that little space. She is a seasoned teacher, but then she doesn't want that distance either. If you get stuck, she'll call. She even gave me her home phone and her address if I ever needed to call her." It was clear from his responses, however, that he considered himself fortunate to have someone like Cathy to whom to turn.

Cathy affirmed Joe's beliefs that he was improving. She expressed her view that "he was trying very hard and, I think, he has something to give to the children." She spoke about her role as trying to teach him some basics. By the beginning of December, Cathy felt that Joe's principal "seems to be fairly pleased with what's going on." She appeared to intuit that Joe needed to believe that she trusted him to do a good job at this point. When Joe volunteered to do a letter dealing with parent conferences for all three teachers, he requested that Cathy check it before it went out. She quietly asserted, "You just write it up, do a good job, and send it out."

By the second half of the school year, Joe was developing a much more patient style of interacting with people, both in his career and at home. In relating a problem in his class about a student who seldom washed, he

talked about being aware of his need to change the indelicate way he had dealt with similar situations in the past. He said that Cathy had taught him to be more discrete in his language. This new behavior had been carried over into his home life, and he spoke about his wife noticing a change in him.

Joe now also appeared to have moved to absolute trust in his relationship with Cathy. He seemed to perceive her as a person with power and political "savvy". At this stage in the relationship, Joe indicated that he not only trusted her but cared about Cathy as a friend.

By the end of March, both Joe and Cathy had been told by the district to expect a thirteenth special education student added to each of their classes. While Cathy believed that "basically Joe's class was doing well at this point, 13 students were going to be difficult". Joe agreed with her. In addition to this problem of Joe's classroom becoming even more challenging to handle, Cathy had been asked to take on a third special education intern, who had started in January and was having serious problems with her classes. Cathy agreed because the other female intern, with whom she had been working, was doing very well and was almost ready to strike out on her own. Both Joe and this newly hired, female intern worked in the same building, a school somewhat removed from the location in which Cathy worked. Once involved in this extra responsibility,

however, Cathy expressed concern about the third intern's negativity toward special education and the staff in the building in which she and Joe worked. Cathy then worried that Joe might be feeding into various, unsubstantiated rumors. Cathy's primary concern was that this kind of whispering and undertone could affect both interns professionally. Since neither of these interns talked to her directly about this hearsay (only speaking in murmurs to one another), Cathy chose to ignore it and place her energy on matters in which she believed she could make an impact.

Caring, combined with objectivity (though seemingly an oxymoron), appeared to be an integral part of the way Cathy functioned with the interns. "I feel very strongly that the success or failure of my interns doesn't reflect on me. As with my students, if I can give them everything that I have the time ...and the ability to give them or whatever, and if that's not enough, then I'm sorry...That's not my fault," declared Cathy. She was still cognizant of Joe's uneasiness with testing and "translating rough scores into grade eqivalents..." as the month of April came and went. She simply accepted this as an individual need of his and provided very concrete help in this kind of procedure. On the other hand, "as far as relating to the kids in the classroom and some other things in the classroom ...," Cathy knew Joe was having successes. She used his strength in this area by encouraging him to even help her with her own

students. He had spontaneously counseled one male student of hers, and she had praised him for his assistance.

Towards the end of the year, Cathy continued to be concerned about Joe's "following through on the things he has to do." She had decided to take the tactic of sitting and waiting "for him to ask" about improving this weaker aspect in his performance. She felt he was beginning to recognize the need to change in this regard.

Cathy didn't have to wait long, because in June she spoke about Joe "as exceeding what I thought he would do at the beginning." Although she had worried throughout the year about whether "the paperwork was ever going to be done right," he had completed his records correctly all by himself for the first time. Furthermore, Cathy mentioned again how well Joe relates to people. She called him "a natural communicator" and claimed he had restored her faith in people's willingness to work hard to change. She described him as having "grown in maturity."

At the end of the year, Joe was much more realistic about his own abilities in the classroom. He, too, felt confident in the areas Cathy had pointed out to be his strengths. Still, he added, "...there's stuff I have to learn, still very shaky about..." When asked if some of the areas in which he now felt secure could be attributable to his relationship with Cathy, he emphatically repeated twice, "Without a doubt. Without a doubt." He added that he knew,

"even if I got stuck next year, I could call her up". He stated how much he appreciated the "18 years (of experience) floating around in this person" and that "what she taught him, you can't learn from a book". Without any prompting, he continued that "I will try to keep tabs on where she's at...just even to know her as a person, as a friend, just to say hello to her, how things going, stuff like that."

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to acquaint the reader with the methodology used in a study designed to collect detailed information about the nature of seven mentor-intern relationships in the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program in 1987-88. An illustration of a product produced by this method is presented in the case study summarized herein.

There are several implications for future researchers which flow from the manner in which the study has been designed. First, the strategy of semi-structured interviews assures comparable data across subjects. In addition, this kind of interview permits enough flexibility for the subjects to delve into other areas, which can add insightful information about the phemomenon described. Next, the data are from the subjects' perspective. Even though other persons, within the same organization in which the subjects work, may offer information to the researcher which

indicates that the subjects' perspective could be inaccurate, an understanding of the subjects' point of view is still critical because behavior is often predicated upon one's beliefs, expectations, and/or thoughts. Thirdly, nonparticipant observation, used in conjunction with interviewing, in many cases, allows the researcher to become less obtrusive in each particular context. Moreover, the researcher's frequent presence in each school building helps him or her to better understand why the subjects have responded the way they have. Finally, and perhaps, most importantly, the method can bring forth detailed descriptions of complex mentor-intern relationships in the mentoring of classroom teachers in a formal program.

There is considerable value, therefore, in this methodology and its resultant cases. In the first place, these case studies allow program coordinators, administrators, researchers, mentors, and other teachers to examine the subjective dimensions of the behaviors of the mentors and interns. Besides this, the cases enable them to learn much information about specific problems particular to certain subjects and content areas. Chronicling of events that occur may serve to enlighten others to that which is commonplace to the teachers who work in specific areas. Furthermore, an understanding of events which can occur within relationships may lead to solutions, or, at least, the brainstorming of new ways to ease the impact of some

problems on those least prepared to deal with them, namely, beginning teachers. As more complete cases of mentor-intern relationships in formalized programs develop from studies of this kind, they may also benefit state policy makers who, through documentation of happenings within each relationship, may be better able to make more informed decisions.

Bibliography

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. (4th edition). New York: Longman, Inc.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklin, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mager, G. M. with Bower, A., Corwin, C., Davis, M., & DeBolt, G., (1987). A report to the State Education Department on the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1986-1987

Mager, G. M. With Corwin, C. (1989). A report to the State Education Department on the New York State Mentor Teacher-Internship Program for 1987-1988. (in press).

Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The lives of teachers. In L. S. Shulman & Sykes, G. (Eds.) Handbook of Teaching and Policy. (pp. 242-260). New York: Longman.

Wildman, T. M., Magliaro, S. G., Niles, J. A. McLaughlin, R. A., & Drill, L. (1988). Sources of teaching problems and the ways beginners solve them : An analysis of the first two years. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.